DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 153 542 HE 009 648

AUTHOR Moxley, Linda S.
TITLE Higher Education: A Philosophical Perspective Using Organizational Principles.
PUB DATE Apr 78
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Freedom; *College Role; Curriculum; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; Environmental Influences; Governance; *Higher Education; *Liberal Arts; Organizational Climate; Organizational Development; *Organizational Theories; Student Development; Teaching Techniques

ABSTRACT

A philosophy of higher education which incorporates organizational principles is presented. The topics addressed include: educational aims and priorities, the external and internal environments, organizational and student development, teaching techniques and curriculum, academic freedom, and governance. Results of other research on related subjects are also presented. (Author/SPG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED153542

Higher Education: A Philosophical Perspective Using Organizational Principles

Submitted by:

Linda S. Moxley
Doctoral Candidate
Center for the Study of Higher Education
The University of Michigan

April 9, 1978

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Moxley

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 009 848

Higher Education: A Philosophical Perspective Using Organizational Principles

Abstract

The purpose of this essay is to present a philosophy of higher education which incorporates organizational principles. The topics addressed include: educational aims and priorities, the external and internal environments, organizational and student development, teaching techniques and curriculum, academic freedom, and governance.

The development of organizational philosophy has progressed through many stages---from the Taylorist approach (Taylor, 1911) which ignored the individual for efficiency to the other one-sided approach of human relations to the current perspective which considers both the technological and social-psychological aspects. Most of the thought and study behind the models and philosophies for organizations have evolved from the profit-making sector rather than from educational organizations. The impact of organizational thought and the specific influence of commercial organizations on higher education are difficult to overlook when reading the higher education history and philosophy literature. Veblen (1957) saw the finger of business control in practically every aspect of the modern university: in the tendency to spend money on conspicuous buildings; in the growth of bureaucracy; in the prominence of fraternities and athletics; in what he believed was the subordination of the graduate school to the undergraduate college; in the vocational courses; in the whole competitive search for prestige (pp. 18, 59, 72, 87, 93, 124, 126, 141). Veysey (1974, pp. 348-350) cited the trustees and such benefactors as Leland and Jane Stanford, Ezra Cornell and Jonas G. Clark as business-minded influences. He also stated:

> Losing a clear sense of purpose, spokesmen for the American university around the turn of the century ran the danger of casually, even unconsciously, accepting the dominant codes of action of their more numerous and influential peers, the leaders of business and industry. (Veysey, 1974, p. 346)

It is because of the recently created models and philosophies within the organizational field, the influence on higher education by industrial and business concerns where the organizational literature has originated, and the need to look for alternative models in times of financial strain that I find it appropriate to relate my philosophy of higher education to organizational principles.

Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975, pp. 69-87) see goal orientation as one characteristic of organizations. An organizational goal has been defined as a set of constraints that limit the scope of action (Simon, 1964, p. 7). In industry and business enterprises, profit-making is an easily discernible goal. In higher education, however, as recognized in Veysey's statement, a sense of purpose is often lost. And, the specific goals or aims in education receive much less consensus. Regarding the aim of liberal education, Babbitt(1908, 1926), Katz and Sanford (1962), and Jerome (1970) see the response to individual student needs to be focal. In contrast, Whitehead (1936, 1957), Dewey (1938), Henderson (1944), and Sagen (1973) point to social needs as the goal for liberal education. And another school of thought which includes Newman (1959), Hutchins (1936, 1953), and Van Doren (1959) supports the obtainment of the intellectual virtues for their own sake as the role of liberal arts education. Disagreement also reigns when the primary aim of universities is considered. Should it be undergraduate education as Gallant (1973) proposes, professional training as suggested by Ortega y Gasset (1966), or graduate education which Veblen (1957) supports?

It is my contention that all the above aims have a place in higher education. Educating for current manpower needs, including professional

curricula, belong within the realm of higher education. Similarly, gaining knowledge for its own sake has a role in a society which has sufficient amounts of leisure time. Further, pure scientific research should not be omitted. Much has been gained through the exercise of idle curiousity, the discovery of penicillin for example. Nor should the individual or social needs be ignored.

The problem seems to be not so much which goals are valid but rather the need for institutions to clearly define which goals they plan to adopt and in what priority. All too many colleges and universities suffer from a vague, diffused dispersion of energies. As Stroup (1966) has recognized, "No human activity seems to fall beyond its scope. It tends to promise all things to all men" (p. 99). One key to a more efficient operation would be the concise definition of institutional goals. In fact, it has been empirically demonstrated that specific goal statements when extended down to the individual level lead to higher performance levels (Bryan & Locke, 1967; Meyer, Kay, & French, 1965). Further, if aims were clearly stated much of the present overlap and duplication of functions among and within higher education institutions and between them and post-secondary education could be eliminated. Another advantage of sharply elaborated goals and their broad communication would be to provide a better fit between the student and faculty goals and those of the institution. This would be a cost saving measure in terms of student and staff retention, satisfaction, and work and learning achievements. But, currently the aims expressed in one institution's catalogue echo those made by hundreds of others.

The effectiveness of higher education could also be reduced be-

cause of the discrepancies between the stated goals and priorities and those for which the faculty are rewarded. According to Lawler's (1973) research, motivation to achieve is based upon past and expected rewards. It is then not difficult to understand why faculty spend their time publishing rather than concentrating their effort in the teaching area, their more frequent primary responsibility. As Caplow and McGee (1958) have said: "Success is likely to come to the man who has learned to neglect his assigned duties in favor of his private professional interests" (p. 221). In essence, for the educational system to be more effective and efficient the stated and the actualized goals should be congruent and the accomplishments should be rewarded differentially according to the related goal's priority.

One reason for the goal diffusion is that institutions have not advertised their chosen goals with the intention of financing their fulfillment. Instead, as Hutchins (1936) has stated, they are "letting financial accidents determine their educational policy" (p. 5). Indeed, all too often yielding to the temptations of immediate financial gain has resulted in the long-term problems of maintaining the donated facilities, paying for the hidden equipment and supply costs, or the struggle to obtain "course takers" in order to continue funded faculty positions. Sound educational principles and documented social and individual educational needs should dictate the acceptance of external funds.

It is not my intention that each institution should limit their scope to only one aim, although some like Nova University, restricted to graduate education, may choose to do so. It is rather that institutions determine which goals they expect to pursue and not be mone-

etarily convinced to alter their direction unless the activity is in line with their long-range plans or responds to unforeseen yet valid educational needs. Some institutions may have social service, research, professional development, and undergraduate and graduate education as their aims but they should be prioritized and precisely stated. However, to refine the educational process for the future, it is imperative that research be conducted to determine which combination of aims provides the highest quality and most economical education. Flexner (1930) and Veblen (1957) claim that for maximum benefit to society, the students and the university, professional education should not be included as a goal. Yet, to my knowledge this remains a value judgement and has not been empirically verified. Even though the educational outcomes are less amenable to data collection in comparison to those in industry, there are quality and quantity measures (e.g. value and personality changes, intellectual skill gains, employment and graduate school admission rates, job satisfaction figures) which could be used to determine the optimal mix of goals and programs. It may be found that there are goal packages which better meet the needs of the faculty, society and the individual consumers. For example, it may be learned that a package of pure and applied research, and professional and graduate education is one highly effective and efficient mix while the liberal arts curriculum is best presented in a single goal institution. But, after research has been conducted to determine the best delivery system, it must be remembered that some institutions may need to provide a more costly education in order to respond to the goal preferences of the students.

Institutional goals and their means should be continuously eval-

uated and updated after thorough study. This practice could relieve the organizations of their goal displacement, where the means have become ritualized and have undermined the established goals (Etzioni, 1964). This is recognized in the research requirements which pervade most doctoral curricula and which include students not wishing to continue such activities. In fact, forty years ago Hutchins (1936) wrote: "The students who are going to be teachers are put through a procedure which was designed to produce investigators" (p. 3). The Doctor of Arts degree may help resolve this means-goal dilemma. Another example of goal displacement is found in the residence life administration where the concept of control is often seen to prevail with greater strength than the educational objectives of the academic community (Eberle & Muston, 1969). Thus, without the continuous evaluation of institutional goals and means there is a ring of truth in Freeman's (1965) remark: "...if the Edsel division had been a department in a university, it would still be there" (p. 75).

Nor can higher education goals and means be developed or evaluated in a vacuum. In the organizational venacular, higher education organizations are 'open systems" (Katz & Kahn, 1965). This means that there is an interdependence between them and their environment in terms of inputs (e.g. students, supplies, equipment) and outputs (e.g. students graduating, services available). College and university administrators and faculty must be aware of student characteristics, the external social, political, and economic conditions, and the effects of their services upon society. It is a delicate balance of influencing, being influenced, and cooperation that has not yet been perfectly met. The

multiple duplications of course offerings within regional institutions and between secondary education and higher education show the absence of an open systems perspective. The extent of fit between individual and organizational needs and goals also demonstrates the amount of consideration given to the open systems view. Without doubt, one of the weaknesses within higher education is that they often operate as units closed to interaction with the outside environment. When they function as closed systems impervious to the outer environment they attempt to recreate the outside activities. In illustration, the role of universities in professional programs should be to provide an intellectual foundation, the theoretical approaches and principles pertinent to the fields. The practical experiences should be acquired through a cooperative arrangement with community agencies. With the possible exception of the medical profession in large institutions, the attempt to provide professional skill training only leads to the inefficient use of resources. Moreover, the quality of education would improve if all curricular areas would establish community-based experiential programs. Hutchins (1936) also discusses the impracticalities of the higher education closed systems approach in the following excerpt:

> A modern heresy is that all education is formal education and that formal education must assume the total responsibility for the full development of the individual. The Greek notion that the city educates the man has been forgotten. Everything that educated the man in the city has to be imported into our schools, colleges, and universities. We are beginning to behave as though the home, the church, the state, the newspaper, the radio, the movies, the neighborhood club, and the boy next door did not exist. All the experience that is daily and hourly acquired from these sources is overlooked, and we set out to supply imitations of it in educational institutions... It is a good principle of educational administration that a college or university should do nothing that another agency can do as well. (pp. 69-70)

Another open systems consideration which remains unused to the utmost is the development of consortia. It appears that the cooperative use of faculty and equipment could help break down the win-loose game among higher education institutions which characterizes the profit-making organizations.

Oppositely, in some respects institutions of higher learning have been too open to the persuasion of external elements. The financial influences of foundations, individual benefactors, and governmental sources have already been cited. The unmeditated responses to student demands or social whims are also illustrative of the need to more closely sift and evaluate the expectations and desires coming from the external environment. As Rourke and Brooks (1966) have stated:

> This highly adaptive characteristic reflects their lack of explicit consideration of where their decisions were taking them or whether or not they wanted to go in this direction (p. 115).

Now, moving from the macro to the micro level, the value assumptions made about man must be explored when developing an educational philosophy. McGregor (1960), past president of Antioch College, has offered two models for viewing man which have received much notoriety in the organizational literature and which may be applied to one's view of students. His Theory X assumptions about people were the following (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975, p. 36):

1. The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can.

2. Because of the human characteristic of dislike of work, most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort toward the achievement of organizational objectives.

3. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition, wants security above all.

The alternative model, or Theory Y assumptions were (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975, pp. 26-27):

1. The expenditure of physical and mental effort in work is as natural as play or rest.

2. External control and the threat of punishment are not the only means for bringing about effort toward organizational objectives. Man will exercise self-direction and self-control in the service of objectives to which he is committed.

3. Commitment to objectives is a function of the rewards associated with their achievement.

4. The average human being learns, under proper conditions, not only to accept but to seek responsibility.

5. The capacity to exercise a relatively high degree of imagination, ingenuity, and creativity in the solution of organizational problems is widely, not narrowly distributed in the population.

It has been the Theory X view of students which has been predominate in the American high school setting. Yet, higher education has not been divorced from the control aspects of this model. It is recognized in the residence hall signing in and out policies and in the academic arena characterized by piece-rate education with regimented course periods and grading systems.

Although no single model of man is in itself capable of explaining the diversity and richness of all behaviors or covering all situations, it is my preference, in line with Theory Y assumptions, that members participating in the educational enterprise view each other as self-directed individuals willing to assume responsibility. And, one behavioral objective of education should be to help move individuals away from the tendencies for needing control and into the state where they

recognize their freedom to choose among alternative goals, beliefs, and behaviors and assume responsibility for their decisions. And, the "Y" characteristic of critical thinking and continuous inquiry should be cultivated and reinforced as higher education objectives. Until the elementary and secondary institutions take this stance, higher education will need to assist students in "learning the learning process" so that they can discover, invent, produce, and generalize about new behaviors. Argyris (1975), an organizational researcher, has in fact systematically investigated the process of unfreezing programmed learning patterns and establishing inquiry-based styles within educational and industrial organizations.

There are particular teaching methods which may either facilitate or hamper self-direction, a sense of responsibility, the quest for knowledge, and critical thinking. The lecture approach has been described as a process whereby the notes of the teacher become the notes of the student without passing through the mind of either (Chickering, 1969, p. 324). A degree which is a product of this method would seem to certify that the student had a fair, if temporary, recollection of what the teachers had said rather than one's ability to analyze, evaluate, and synthesize. In support, Dressel and Mayhew (1958) have empirically learned that critical thinking is best fostered in the context of regular studies managed so processes other than memorization are required. The method which would encourage one to assume responsibility for his beliefs and which would foster a yearning for discovery would be, by definition, the Socratic method where statements would require justification and where asking the right questions are more important than providing the professor-determined "right" or "programmed" response.

With this method, as Morris (1961) has observed, the student gets "personally 'tangled up' in the subject matter" (p. 392).

As an aid to the fulfillment of these objectives it would be ideal to have no fixed time units applied to the areas of study as Chickering (1969, pp. 327-328) has recommended. Students and professors would simply work as long as it takes to accomplish what they want, at the depth and thoroughness they wish. This bears four principal advantages over the usual semester or term system: (1.) faculty and students could achieve a closer fit between the nature of the study undertaken, its purposes, and the amount of time devoted to it; (2.) off-campus experiences could more frequently become integral parts of academic study; (3.) the system could readily respond to shifting interests and demands; (4.) and, additional sectors of the population would be able to participate in the educational process. It is not surprising that a similar approach with work time flexibility has been suggested by Kahn (1974) for business and industrial organizations.

But, even though the Socratic teaching method and the flexible time element have ideal properties for some institutional objectives, diversity is a necessity. The importance of individual needs, background, and interests, in terms of satisfaction and achievement outcomes, was clearly documented in the late 1920s at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company (Roethlisberger & Dickson, 1939; The Hawthorne, 1975). Likewise, for the most effective and efficient learning to occur in higher education, the professors' preferred teaching styles and the students' learning styles should be considered.

Students should have the opportunity to select among various instructional methods (e.g. self-paced methods--teaching machines or independent study, demonstrations, lecture, discussion, practicum) when fulfilling their academic objectives. However, before the student makes decisions regarding the modes of instruction, he should be tested to determine the style most effective for him and be shown data regarding the types of outcomes, the intellectual skills developed, when alternative methods are used in the various curricular areas. That is, students should be encouraged to select the discovery methods that are most compatible with their particular learning styles and with the disciplines themselves. And, as it was suggested for the determination of institutional aims, cost-benefit and student interest studies should be continuously conducted to determine which instructional methods will be employed and advertised. With few exceptions such as the great books discussion method used at St. John's College and the extensive application of teaching machine instruction at Orchard Ridge Community College, the students lack instructional information and are left to assume that higher education instruction will parallel their previous experiences. It is this trial and error approach to education which should be eliminated. Both the students and the organization's administration and faculty should begin to make rational decision based upon data. Federal funds may be required to initiate the investigation of instructional outcomes and to subsidize institutions with the most costly methods in order to maintain the necessary diversity.

In addition to the recognition of individual differences through the matching of students with institutions and instructional modes,

the faculty members must be sensitive to the differences within the learning setting. As Hook (1969) has noted: "Those teachers who set out to teach a class of students equally, that is to say, with an eye on what they presumably have in common, rediscover Aristotle's insight that such equal treatment does an injustice to every student who has more or less than what is assumed to be common" (p. 69).

Another important variable to acknowledge when attempting to provide an environment where students are encouraged to develop and become accountable for their beliefs and values involves the organizational design of the student to professor and the student to student interactional units. As Feldman and Newcomb (1969) have pointed out: "The size, in itself, of an institution devoted to higher education matters little if the internal organization is appropriate to its size" (p. 337). And, Katz and Kahn (1966) have stated:

> The formal, hierarchical organization is an instrument of great economies over unorganized effort; it achieves great unity and compliance. But its deficiencies include great waste of human potential for innovation and creativity and great psychological cost to the members...(p. 222)

It is from an awareness of these observations that I support the breaking down of the vertical hierarchy in large institutions and the establishment of horizontal units as has been achieved at Michigan State University in the form of residential colleges. It is within these decentralized units among known others where beliefs, behaviors and values will be called to question, where accountability will be required, and where peer and professorial influences will be most effective. To use an industrial analogy, we would be taking students off the impersonal educational assembly line and redesigning the socio-technical system so

that they may become a part of something that can be experienced and known, where individuals feel responsible for their involvement, and where continuous feedback is provided. But, here again, data must be gathered. This time it is to determine the optimal size of the instructional and living units.

Based upon the previous discussions of differentiating goals and the differences in individual student and faculty needs and interests, it is easy to understand why differentiation is a defining characteristic of organizations (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975, pp. 87-94). There are, however, still more forms of differentiation which demand attention. Within the organizational literature, the term differentiation is usually used with reference to the tasks performed. Porter, Lawler, and Hackman (1975, p. 88) have indicated that one reason for this inherent organizational feature is that there are too many types of tasks for any single individual to be able to perform them adequately. This is confirmed in higher education. With the rapid expansion in the depth and breadth of knowledge it is an impossible feat to have competence in all areas. No longer are the professor's roles like that of John Smith of Dartmouth, whose appointment made him "Professor of English, Latin, Greek, Chaldee, etc., and such other languages as he shall have time for" (Rudolph, 1968, p. 158). And, in response to the overabundant material to be assimilated in comparison to the individual's limited capacity to learn, Ortega y Gasset (1966, pp. 49-55) has recommended that higher education be economically based upon the student rather than upon the knowledge. Yet, even with his desire for simplification and unification, differentiation prevailed in his educational

model in the form of five divisional areas which comprise the basic curriculum.

In essence, no matter how the curricula are presented, differentiation is manifest. When this differentiation becomes a part of the individual, when actions are more finely responsive to purpose or outside conditions, when interests become varied, and tastes more diverse, the individual becomes a more developed human being. And, it is the aim of liberal education to foster this increased differentiation, the freeing of the individual from a limited outlook and opening him to all the possibilities and impossibilities of his situation and the heightening of awareness and sensitivity.

There appears to be no one best way to divide the material to insure the individual's differentiation. I have found no convincing evidence that the desired end state cannot be reached by a variety of paths. This is the organizational principle of equifinality (Katz & Kahn , 1966, pp. 25-26). It is conceivable that curricular separations according to the methods used to discover truth could produce the same results as curriculum divided according to the extent to which the content areas are factually verifiable (e.g. direct observation, indirectly measured, faith). To date the basis for the division rests upon individual value judgements regarding one's concept of knowledge, individuals, and the cosmos.

What may be more important than the arbitrary divisions is the degree to which individuals specialize in one domain without acquiring the necessary accompaniments of diversification and integration. Ortega y Gasset (1966, p. 76) has rightly lamented the need to humanize the

scientist who knows only one thing. Van Doren (1959) has said, "The first thing a doctor, lawyer, priest, or engineer has to be is a person" (p. 168). Similarly, Babbitt (1908) has addressed the hazzards of solitary specialization:

> The work that leads to a doctors degree is a constant temptation to sacrifice one's growth as a man to one's growth as a specialist. We must be men before being entomologists. The old humanism was keenly alive to the loss of mental balance that may come from knowing any one subject too well. (p. 107)

And, Nietzsche (1924) has written:

> ...a specialist in science gets to resemble nothing but a factory workman who spends his whole life in turning one particular screw or handle on a certain instrument or machine. (p. 39)

Indeed, the need for educational institutions to promote individual expansion parallels the recent industrial moves to implement job enlargement and job enrichment programs.

Integration is crucial. When the student sees his academic work as a disassembled collage or when the professor neglects the student's affective realm and only sees the intellect aspects, education is stifled. The relationships among parts must be perceived and constructed so that more complex wholes result. In sum, it is through the sequences of differentiation and integration that individuals more capably adapt to varied roles and situations in their environment. I definitely am not the sole supporter of this learning concept; it has been with us for a long time. It is reflected in Dewey's (1938) "reconstruction of experience", Festinger's (1975) "cognitive dissonance", Heider's (1958) "balance theory", Newcomb's (1961) "strain for symmetry", Helson's (1964) "adaptation level theory",

and Rogers' (1961) "development of congruence". The dilemma is that the importance of differentiation and integration has been too often overlooked.

Hutchins (1953) has said, "If we split the world up in order to gain detailed knowledge of it, at some point we have to put it together again in order to understand it" (p. 24). How may the "put it back together" or the integration process be facilitated? Kerr (1969, p. 20) has said that he sometimes thinks the modern university is held together by the faculty's common grievance over parking and that Hutchins has suggested that the unification is evident only in the central heating system. These remarks, although stated in jest, do illustrate how the principle of integration has been slighted. Lawrence and Lorsch (1967, 1969), the key exponents of the integration and differentiation principles in organizational psychology, have learned through scientific investigation that the more effective organizations possessed greater integration. They have noted three methods used to achieve integration: a formal integrating department; individual integrators; and managerial contact through the chain of command. The establishment of a specialized department to unite the activities of several departments is virtually unrealized in the education setting with the exception of interdisciplinary departments who selectively limit their integration activities. Nor is the use of individual integrators characteristically a formalized function within educational organizations. Observation proves that this predominately occurs through temporary committees, or ad hoc or self-appointments. The neglect of this role is seen in

the limited number of staff members whose specific task is to assist students with the integration of their curricular and co-curricular activities and experiences. And finally, even though a healthy chain of command exists, often covering a large span of control by the means of a divisional rather than a departmental structure, minimal effort to integrate the curriculum is apparent. Thus, when considering the Lawrence and Lorsch integrating mechanisms, higher education is presented with a tremendous challenge.

The task of integration, however, does not end with these measures. The use of management by objectives with interlocking goals among departments and throughout the hierarchy would bring integration within the system and subtle integrative effects upon the learners. Synthesis offered by individual professors and team-teaching efforts are more direct means for facilitating the integration process. Until data are available regarding the outcomes of these measures, I cannot reject any instrumentality which in the remotest way promotes the development and continuation of this process within the individual. In contrast, Hutchins (1936, p. 60) has seen administrative devices (e.g. roving professorships and divisional organization) as mere palliatives. He provides the alternative that all faculty and students should hold a common stock of fundamental concepts which would allow cross-fertilization. I agree with this Hutchins pronouncement if the fundamentals are attached to the unique experiences and traits of the individual. This would permit individuals to be different from what they were and different from each other while gaining elements of integration. Indeed, all individuals should have

the opportunity to explore the truth and reality discovering tools used by the mathematicians, metaphysicians, philosophers, artists, and the social and natural scientists. The scientist, lawyer, educator, laborer, etc. would then have a more complete repertoire as a basis for adapting, interacting, and maneuvering within the environment. This is not to say that everyone has the ability to do "college work", but rather, all must have the opportunity to participate in the educational process at their own level and at their own pace in order to actualize their fullest potential.

And, as Sanford (1971, pp. 14-15) has observed, this integrating and differentiating process is education in contrast to training. Training does not build upon the uniqueness of the individual but instead tends to process people so that they become more similar. For the experienced adult learner, education and training may occur simultaneously, But, in general, education should precede training. This would help avoid the premature vocational choices made in the absence of enlarging experiences. Further, in this way, training may be more effective and advance at a faster pace.

Academic freedom is one organizational characteristic unique to higher education. [Industrial unions now negotiate for the employees' freedom of expression without penalty; and yet, this does not represent a satisfactory parallel.] The preservation of this distinctive role necessitates that the organization and its members be externally open to, aware of, and vigorously debate the significant issues while they remain closed to taking a collective public stand.

Academic freedom may be viewed as an element which permits

differentiation, the differentiation of ideas, and which summons their integration into the individual's mental framework. It is through the free interplay of ideas that knowledge is purified and skills of critical thought are honed. The interchange of differing perspectives must proceed so that reason and ultimately testable statements may replace intuition, personal prejudice or mere opinion. As J. F. Kennedy has expressed: "We enjoy the comfort of opinion without the discomfort of thought" (Schlesinger, 1965, pp. 645-646). And, Hook (1970) has stated: "Free academic activity implies an openness to all points of view, provided only that they express the conclusion of honest inquiry" (p. 37). Thus, along with the professorial right to express one's perspective comes the corresponding responsibilities, the responsibilities to base one's thought on critical analysis and to provide justification for one's position.

It is within an environment where academic freedom is practiced, in an atmosphere of continuous controversy, that education flourishes and self-examination prevails. Student must be provided with models who are actively engaged in inquiry, display the interconnections of freedom, choice, and responsibility, and who have strong value commitments of their own. In fact, it has been empirically shown by Jacob (1957) that institutions having a potent effect on values were characterized by individual teachers who had strong value commitments of their own. It must be understood, however, that each professor's personal perspective must be countered by the presentation of opposing views. To ensure the freedom to learn and the maximum differentiation, alternative religious, political, economic, and social stances demand treatment. Further, students must have the freedom, and be encouraged

to challenge, contest, and question the differing perspectives. This process will help awaken the students to the need to know themselves and not be steamrolled into social choices. Then, they too must assume the responsibility for their formulated beliefs and the way in which they have selected to integrate the diverse perspectives into their mode of operation. And finally, it must become a reality that the students' capabilities and potentialities are the only constraints to learning, not financial limitations or social prejudices. Loans, grants, fellowships and work-study programs must be available so that students may have the freedom to learn at the institutions appropriate for their needs and goals.

Faculty not only must have the freedom to teach and the students the right to learn, but both should have the right and responsibility to participate in selective aspects of the institutional governance process. This practice is indorsed by organizational research findings. Studies have indicated that participation can lead to higher organizational effectiveness (e.g. Coch & French, 1948; Lawler & Hackman, 1969). Participation can increase the amount and accuracy of information used in the decision-making process and participation permits a sense of "ownership" which increases the likelihood that members will develop supportive practices and behaviors (Porter, Lawler, & Hackman, 1975, pp. 418-419). Further, the determinants of the quality of group problem-solving have been systematically studied. Investigations have found that homogeneous groups produce fewer high quality solutions than do heterogeneous

groups (Hoffman, 1959; Hoffman & Maier, 1961). Presumably, diversity of approach among group members facilitates problem-solving. It is for these reasons that I see both student and faculty involvement in the institutional decision-making processes.

Two factors should be used to determine the composition and the numerical strength of constituents that make up the decision-making bodies: the amount of expertise possessed by the various organizational elements and the degree to which the resulting decisions affect their institutional activities. The perimeters of involvement should be clearly defined and explicitly communicated to avoid unrealistic expectations. Indeed, the faculty should have the ruling authority in curricular development for they possess the necessary information, experience, and historical perspective which are not equalled by administrators, trustees, or advisory committee members. Students should have consultative participation in these matters so that their academic work continues to be in harmony with their goals and objectives. Some of their academic interests (e.g. placement, curriculum, admissions) should be expressed in the form of minority representation on academic committees. Student input into other dimensions of the academic affairs (e.g. faculty evaluations) may be gained through brief surveys. And, feedback regarding the survey results, as well as the decisions made, should be provided to the students in order to maintain their sense of ownership within the system. Nor should the on-going student exchanges with faculty be ignored as an effective means for expressing preferences. It is within the student affairs area, however, that students should

have a more powerful and direct influence. The extent of constituent expertise and the zones of decision impact are also variables to be examined when determining the composition of the governing boards. It would be extremely unusual for an industry or commercial corporation to have a board of directors whose principal interests were unrelated to the function of the organization. But, all too frequently educational expertise has gone unrepresented on the higher education boards. Educators external to the institution should be selected if departmental bias is perceived to be a concern. But, their absence must be no more. This is not to say that lay expertise is not essential, but only that the vision of the boards needs to be broadened by the inclusion of other pertinent areas of expertise. And finally, a student representative, preferably one with a comprehensive view, such as a student government president, should be available to provide information but not for involvement in the decision-making process.

In conclusion, my philosophical views will have been understood if the following points were recognized:

1. In contrast to Veblen's (1954, p. 22) view that "the intrusion of business principles in the university goes to weaken and retard the pursuit of learning", many current organizational principles do have beneficial application to higher education. And, in contrast to Brubacher's (1970, p. 114) opinion, many comparisons between higher education and industrial and commercial corporations may appropriately be made.

2. The overriding question should not be what aims (e.g. teaching, service, research, professional training) are suitable for higher education institutions but rather what are the most effective, efficient and least conflicting mixtures.

3. Each institution should clearly define and publicize its aims and the methodologies used to achieve the aims. Through a better individual-organizational fit satisfaction and quality output would result and costly turnover, transfers, and withdrawals would be reduced.

4. The educational system must be pluralistic in the mix of aims, teaching methods and curricula in order to respond to the needs, goals and experiences of the students. This demonstrates the organizational principle of equifinality (i.e., there is no one best way).

5. For effective and efficient functioning, the stated goals and those actualized must be made more congruent and accomplishments should be differentially rewarded according to the related goal's priority.

6. Higher education organizations must be aware of their open systems characteristics so that resources may be preserved. Further, they must recognize the importance of selectively screening the two-way influences in order to maintain the institutional goals and freedoms.

7. Institutional members should be seen as possessing and promoting the Theory Y qualities of seeking self-direction and responsibility rather than desiring or needing control. Also, the act of continuous search and inquiry should be encouraged as an organizational objective.

8. Organizational and individual specialization should be accompanied by differentiation and integration. Students should be urged to acquire the skills of diverse disciplines so that their potential may be realized. The development of the whole individual is paramount.

9. Investigations must be conducted to determine which environmental and instructional characteristics (e.g. organizational structures, management by objectives, team-teaching, the size of living and learning units) promote the never ending drive for the integration and differentiation of knowledge. Until such results are known, all modalities which may facilitate the process should be implemented.

10. Academic freedom must prevail in order to purify knowledge and to stimulate self-realization.

11. The involvement of multiple constituencies in the governance process is required for the most effective and efficient outcomes. Participation should be according

to expertise and the amount of impact the decisions have upon the constituents.

12. Educational decisions and philosophical statements should be taken out of the realm of intuition and opinion and developed instead on the basis of factual evidence.

In this way my current educational thoughts are drawn to a close. The contrast of creative and analytical thought has been purposefully intertwined throughout. Haven't the educational philosophers waited long enough to think in the tensions between analysis and existentialism? My integration and differentiation shall continue.

References

Argyris, C. Adult learning and leadership education. Unpublished manuscript, July, 1975.

Babbitt, I. Literature and the American college: Essays in defense of the humanities. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1908.

Babbitt, I. Humanist and specialist. Address made at the dedication of the Marston Hall of Languages, Brown University, October, 1926. Providence, R. I.: Brown University Papers, 1926.

Brubacher, J. S. The theory of higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 1970, 41(2), 98-115.

Bryan, J. F., & Locke, E. A. Goal setting as a means of increasing motivation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1967, 51(3), 274-277.

Caplow, T., & McGee, R. J. The academic marketplace. New York: Basic Books, 1958.

Chickering, A. W. Education and identity. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1975.

Coch, L., & French, J. R. P., Jr. Overcoming resistance to change. Human Relations, 1948, 1, 512-533.

Dewey, J. Democracy and education. New York: Macmillan, 1938.

Dewey, J. The problem of the liberal arts college. American Scholar, 1944, 13, 391-393.

Dressel, P. L., & Mayhew, L. B. And there should be more. In P. L. Dressel (ed.), Evaluation in the basic college at Michigan State University. New York: Harper, 1958.

Eberle, A. W., & Muston, R. A. The role of the chief student personnel administrator in the residence hall: Locus of conflict. NASPA Journal, 1969, 7(2), 91-96.

Etzioni, A. Modern Organizations. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice Hall, 1964.

Feldman, K. A., & Newcomb, T. M. The impact of college on students: An analysis of four decades of research (Vol. 1). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. New York: Row, Peterson, 1957.

Flexner, A. Universities: American, English, German. New York: Oxford University Press, 1930.

Freeman, R. A. Crisis in college finance: Time for new solutions. Washington, D. C.: The Institute for Social Science Research.

Gallant, T. F. Dewey's child-centered education in contemporary academe. Educational Forum, 1973, 37, 411-419.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Helson, H. Adaptation-level theory. New York: Harper, 1964.

Henderson, A. D. Vitalizing liberal education: A study of the liberal arts program. New York: Harper & Bros., 1944.

Hoffman, L. R. Homogeneity of member personality and its effect on group problem-solving. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1959, 58, 27-32.

Hoffman, L. R., & Maier, N. R. F. Quality and acceptance of problem solutions by members of homogeneous and heterogeneous groups. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62(3), 401-407.

Hook, S. Academic freedom and academic anarchy. New York: Cowles Book Co., 1970.

Hutchins, R. M. The higher learning in America. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1936.

Hutchins, R. M. The university of utopia. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1953.

Jacob, P. E. Changing values in college. New York: Harper, 1957.

Jerone, J. Culture out of anarchy: The reconstruction of American higher learning. New York: Herder & Herder, 1970.

Kahn, R. The work module: A proposal for the humanization of work. In J. O'Toole (Ed.), Work and the quality of life: Resource papers for work in America. Cambridge, Mass.: The M. I. T. Press, 1974.

Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. The social psychology of organizations. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1966.

Katz, J., & Sanford, N. The curriculum in the perspective of the theory of personality development. In N. Sanford (Ed.), A Psychological and social interpretation of the higher learning. New York: Wiley & Sons, 1962.

Kerr, C. The uses of the university. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1963.

Lawler, E. E., III. Motivation in work organizations. Monterey, Calif.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1973.

Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. The impact of employee participation in the development of pay incentive plans: A field experiment. Journal of Applied Psychology, 1969, 53, 469-471.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. Organization and environment. Boston: Harvard Business School, Division of Research, 1967.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. Developing organizations: Diagnosis and action. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1969.

McGregor, D. The human side of enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1960.

Meyer, H. H., Kay, E., & French, J. P. Split roles in performance appraisal. Harvard Business Review, 1965, 43(1), 123-129.

Morris, V. C. Philosophy and the American school. Cambridge, Mass.: The Riverside Press, 1961.

Newcomb, T. M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, 1961.

Newman, J. H. The idea of a university. Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Co., 1959.

Nietzsche, F. W. On the future of our educational institutions (translated by J. M. Kennedy). New York: Macmillan Co., 1924.

Ortega y Gasset, J. Mission of the university. New York: The Norton Library, 1966.

Porter, L. W., Lawler, E. E., & Hackman, J. R. Behavior in organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1975.

Roethlisberger, F. J., & Dickson, W. J. Management and the worker. Boston, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1939.

Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Rourke, F. E., & Brooks, G. E. The managerial revolution in higher education. Baltimore, Md.: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1966.

Rudolph, F. The American college and university: A history. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1968.

Sagen, H. B. The professions: A neglected model for undergraduate education. Liberal Education, 1973, 59, 507-519.

Sanford, N. Aims of college education. In C. W. Havice (Ed.), Campus values. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1967.

Schlesinger, A. M., Jr. A thousand days. Boston, Mass.: Houghton Mifflin, 1965.

Simon, H. A. On the concept of organizational goal. Administrative Science Quarterly, 1964, 9, 1-22.

Stroup, H. H. Bureaucracy in higher education. New York: Free Press, 1966.

Taylor, F. W. The principles of scientific management. New York: Harper, 1911.

The Hawthorne studies: A synopsis. Appendix D in E. L. Cass & F. G. Zimmer (Eds.), Man and work in society. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1975.

Van Doren, M. Liberal education. Boston, Mass.: Beacon Press, 1959.

Veblen, T. The higher learning in America: A memorandum on the conduct of universities by business men. New York: Sagamore Press, 1957.

Veysey, L. R. The emergence of the American university. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1974.

Whitehead, A. N. Harvard: The future. Atlantic Monthly, 1936, 158, 260-270.

Whitehead, A. N. The aims of education and other essays. New York: Free Press, 1957.